DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 123 CS 502 178

AUTHOR Hellweg, Susan A.
TITLE Implementation of Various Semantic Differential Coding Strategies as a Function of Responses to the Ideal Source in the Prediction of Overall Credibility and Homophily.
PUB DATE Nov 77
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association (Phoenix, Arizona, November 20-23, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); *Credibility; *Elections; *Measurement Techniques; Media Research; Political Affiliation; *Political Attitudes; Politics; Prediction; *Public Opinion; *Semantic Differential
IDENTIFIERS Ford (Gerald R)

ABSTRACT

A study was designed to investigate the consequences of various coding strategies on the semantic differential as a function of responses to an ideal source in the prediction of overall credibility and homophily. The study was also intended to provide additional evidence for the disconfirmation of the underlying extremity assumption of the semantic differential. One week prior to the 1976 presidential election, 390 undergraduates completed two questionnaires containing credibility and homophily items: the first questionnaire in response to the ideal male candidate, and the second in response to the current candidate, Gerald Ford. The second set was augmented by a request to indicate how nearly ideal Ford was perceived to be. Data were processed by a single sample t-test, strength-of-association test, and multiple regression analysis. Additional evidence was found for the disconfirmation of the extremity assumption of the semantic differential. Neither recording strategy provided a better predictor for credibility or homophily than did the standard coding strategy. (Data tables are included.) (Author/DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157123

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IMPLEMENTATION OF VARIOUS SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CODING STRATEGIES AS A FUNCTION OF RESPONSES TO THE IDEAL SOURCE IN THE PREDICTION OF OVERALL CREDIBILITY AND HOMOPHILY

Susan A. Hellweg

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan A. Hellweg

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention
Behavioral Sciences Interest Group

November 1977
Phoneix, Arizona

CS502178

The author is currently the Assistant Director of Research and holds a faculty position in the Behavioral Science Graduate Program at California State University, Dominguez Hills. This paper is based upon her doctoral dissertation, directed by Dr. Kenneth K. Sereno at the University of Southern California, 1977.

IMPLEMENTATION OF VARIOUS SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL CODING STRATEGIES AS A FUNCTION OF RESPONSES TO THE IDEAL SOURCE IN THE PREDICTION OF OVERALL CREDIBILITY AND HOMOPHILY

Context of the Problem

Communication researchers have devoted considerable attention to the evaluation of communication sources, as well as to the variables which affect and are affected by them. The notion that communication effectiveness is mediated by these evaluations has received widespread empirical support.[1] Additional empirical evidence[2] suggests that perceptions of source credibility and homophily are part of the assessment of a communicator.[3] Receivers are more persuaded by communication sources perceived as credible than by those perceived less favorably; sources homophilous with their receivers are generally more persuasive than those who are not.

Assuming that the semantic differential is the appropriate instrument to measure both source credibility and homophily, one might suspect that the ideal communication source in terms of these constructs would be located at the extreme positive end of the scale.[4] This would appear to be an underlying assumption of the semantic differential, with the rating of such a source decreasing as the peak response frequency moves down the scale toward the opposite extreme end of the scale. Such an interpretation would reflect the monotonic function of the scale. Since both constructs have been shown empirically to be multidimensional in nature, one would then expect the ideal source to be described in extreme positive terms on each of the dimensions. Assuming, for example, that the dimensions of credibility identified by McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972) for public figures were viable, then the ideal source, under these terms, would be considered: (1) extremely competent; (2) extremely high in character; (3) extremely composed; (4) extremely extroverted; and (5) extremely sociable. While it may be intuitively reasonable to accept this assumption, researchers have recently become interested in examining it empirically for a number of reasons.

The assumption that one extreme of the semantic differential represents the ideal source refutes heterogeneous perception of high and low credibility by an audience. Individuals do, in fact, perceive other individuals differently in reference to the construct, since their values, attitudes and referents differ.

Initial research emanating from the homophily literature[5] suggests that individuals prefer to communicate with those very similar to themselves and that under such conditions communication is highly effective. The inference to be drawn from such research is that people tend to be attracted to those similar to themselves. If, indeed, this is the case, then one might expect a person to rate the ideal source as someone similar to himself/herself. The homophily principle would suggest that the ideal credible source would be away from the extreme positive end of the scale[6] and that there would be a high degree of difference among receivers as to the specific positioning of the ideal source on the scale.[7] For example, introverted and extroverted receivers might differ in their positioning of the ideal source on an extroversion dimension of credibility.

A review of the literature for the two source valence constructs provides contradictory evidence for predicting the positioning of the ideal credible source on the semantic differential. On the one hand, the credibility literature would predict the positioning at the extreme, on the basis that people prefer to associate with those perceived as highly credible.[8] On the other hand, the homophily literature would predict the positioning of the ideal credible source away from the extreme, on the basis that people prefer to associate with those perceived as similar to themselves.

The semantic differential is often used as a research tool in the induction of high and low forms of credibility. If the extreme end of the scale were not to represent the ideal in all cases, then a researcher might falsely assume: (1) that he/she had established high credibility when the responses were marked at the extreme; or (2) that he/she had not established high credibility when the responses were not marked at the extreme.

The assumption that the extreme position on a homophily scale represents ideal source perception refutes differential preference among receivers as to the desirable amount of similarity between source and receiver. (It is possible that it would vary by target source type, as well as by individual receiver.)

In addition, it seems reasonable to assume that individuals do not interpret scale items provided within instruments that measure credibility and homophily in the same manner. Such instruments do not offer operational definitions relative to item content to respondents. Therefore, what one specific item means to one individual, regardless of any personal difference in attitudes, values, or referents, may not be what it means to another individual.

Empirical research which relates to the questioning of the underlying assumption of the semantic differential as it applies to the positioning of the ideal source is provided by Tannenbaum, Greenberg, and Silverman (1962), Clark, Stewart, and Marston (1972), Heston (1973), and Hellweg (1976). While not designing their study specifically to examine the semantic differential, Tannenbaum, Greenberg, and Silverman asked respondents to indicate their conceptualization of the ideal president, so as to examine it against their conceptualizations of two presidential candidates, Richard Nixon and John Kennedy. In doing so, they found that for the ideal president, the ratings fell in one of three categories (a seven being the highest point on the semantic differential scale) for each of the following adjectives: (1) between six and seven--wise, fair, experienced, strong, active, deep, and calm; (2) between five and six--virile and colorful; and (3) between four and five--liberal, young, and warm.

In requesting respondents to indicate their conceptualization of the highest credible source, Clark, Stewart, and Marston found the mean for all dimensions on a seven-point semantic differential to be at least .786 away from the extreme positive end; for three of the five dimensions involved in their analysis, the researchers found the highest credible source to be more than one full scale unit away from the extreme positive end.

Using deviation scores[9] as a primary basis for analysis, Heston found the ideal credible source on a seven-point semantic differential to be moderately competent, highly sociable, of good character, moderately composed, and neutral in terms of extroversion, the researcher also found that such a conceptualization varies over source types. None of these studies, however, took into consideration the sex of the target source or the sex of the respondent. In none of these studies was there an attempt made to establish whether or not there was statistical significance in the data.

More recently, Hellweg conducted a study with military officers to determine the positioning of the ideal supervisor and subordinate on the semantic differential. In doing so, she found that: (1) for the ideal supervisor, all homophily items and 70% of the credibility items were positioned significantly away from the extreme end of the scale; and (2) for the ideal subordinate, all homophily items and 60% of the credibility items were positioned significantly away from the extreme end of the scale.[10] Based upon these findings, it was concluded that source credibility conforms more to the extreme positioning on the semantic differential scale than does homophily for ideal sources, at least as defined in this study.

The performance of a factor analysis allows for the unveiling of common elements which describe a construct. Through examination of scale subsets which group into related clusters, the factors and their underlying structures can be identified. One of the ways in which this can be accomplished is through the analysis of data derived from the administration of semantic differential items

to respondents. Such an analysis assumes the equal construction of the scale items, specifically in terms of the individual positioning of responses. It presupposes that a "five" on one scale (irrespective of the specific bipolar adjectives utilized) is equal to a "five" on another scale, as well as that the extreme positions are located in the same place for each.

When an individual responds to a target source on a semantic differential in reference to a number of scale items, he/she does so in accord with his/her conceptualization of the ideal within that source category. Individuals acquire an overall vision of the ideal and use it as a gauge in judging the acceptability of actual target sources. If the ideal is positioned at the extreme, then the respondent uses the extreme end of the scale as a base from which to evaluate the live referent. Having this conceptualization in mind, the individual positions his/her target source by counting an appropriate number of scale units away from the extreme (if he/she does not, in fact, position the target source at the extreme).

Customarily, a factor analysis clusters related items (based upon similarity of responding patterns over a number of individuals) into dimensions. This procedure is performed on the basis that each scale subset operates on the same numerical principle from positive to negative evaluations. If a number of individuals were to respond to the two items shown in Figure 1 below in a similar manner (such that the items seemed to go together for each respondent), then it is likely that they would emerge from a factor analysis on the same dimension.

Respondent A

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	___	x	___	___	___	___	___	unfriendly
nice	___	x	___	___	___	___	___	awful

Respondent B

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	___	___	x	___	___	___	___	unfriendly
nice	___	___	x	___	___	___	___	awful

Respondent C

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	___	___	___	x	___	___	___	unfriendly
nice	___	___	___	x	___	___	___	awful

Figure 1. Responding Patterns for the Emergence of Items on a Single Dimension through Normal Factor Analytic Procedures.

An interesting question, however, arises in view of the possibility that the ideal source might not be positioned at the extreme positive end of the semantic differential for all items. If, indeed, this is the case, then the interpretation drawn from factor analyses, as they are currently derived, is somewhat faulty. In this case, the referent used by the respondent in evaluating the acceptability of the target source would not consistently, if ever, be in the same position. Assuming that a respondent counts scale units away from his/her conceptualization of the ideal source in judging a live referent, a serious discrepancy in the interpretation of responding patterns could occur in the performance of a factor analysis as depicted in Figure 2 below:

Respondent A

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly		I	A					unfriendly
nice	I	A						awful

Respondent B

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	I	A						unfriendly
nice		I	A					awful

I = Positioning for Ideal Source
A = Positioning for Actual Source

Figure 2. An Example of Responding Patterns, with Various Positionings of the Ideal Source.

In this instance (given that a normal factor analysis does not take into consideration the positioning of the ideal), the items would not be likely to load on the same dimension. At the same time, however, the number of scale units between ideal and actual scores is the same for both individuals shown in Figure 2. If the ideal source positions were lined up for both respondents, then the actual scores would also be in accord with one another, suggesting the possibility that an adjusted scale might produce a more viable factor analytic solution. The fact that individuals use their conceptualization of the ideal as a criterion in measuring the acceptability of real sources suggests that this is an important consideration.

It would seem to also follow that if, indeed, the ideal is not always located at the extreme, and an individual marks the extreme in evaluating an actual source, another process could be operating. The semantic differential, as it is currently interpreted, provides no opportunity for an overly positive evaluation, one which a respondent feels is beyond the appropriateness for the source in question. For example, if an individual were to evaluate the acceptability of a political candidate and felt that person were "too perfect," he/she would have no way of indicating it on a semantic differential scale. If, however, one can accept the notion that the ideal may not always be located at the extreme positive end of the scale, then there would be a means for a respondent to provide such an evaluation, as shown in Figure 3 below:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
friendly	A	I						unfriendly

I = Positioning for Ideal Source
A = Positioning for Actual Source

Figure 3. An Example of Ideal and Actual Scores for an Overly Positive Target Source Evaluation.

In the example shown in Figure 3, one can presume that a rating in the number one position is as negative an evaluation as one in the number three position. In both cases, the evaluation of the actual target source is one scale unit away from the positioning of the ideal source.

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to investigate the consequences of various coding strategies upon the semantic differential in the prediction of overall credibility and homophily as a function of responses to an ideal communication source. In conjunction with the determination of individual item positionings for this ideal source, it was the intention of this study to provide further evidence for the challenging of the underlying extremity assumption of the semantic differential, in this case, within a political campaign context.

Subjects

The three hundred and ninety subjects employed in this study were students from social science classes at California State University, Long Beach. Of these, 49.7% were males and 49.7% were females (no response: 0.5%).

Materials

The instruments employed in this study were the following: (1) for measuring source credibility, the scales (thirty semantic differential items) developed, specifically for assessing the perceived credibility of public figures, by McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd (1972);[11] and (2) for measuring homophily, the scales (thirteen semantic differential[12] items) developed, specifically for assessing the perceived homophily of public figures, by Andersen and Todd (1975).[13]

Procedure

The administration of all questionnaires to the subjects occurred within the week prior to the 1976 General Election. The instructor for each class introduced the researcher to his/her students as a graduate student currently engaged in perceptual research. The researcher then instructed class members in completing the particular scale items given to them. Initially, subjects were asked to complete credibility and homophily items in response to the ideal male political candidate.[14] After all of the ideal candidate questionnaires had been collected in their completed form, the researcher then distributed another set of identical questionnaires[15] and requested respondents to fill these out using as a personal referent a current political candidate, in this case, President Gerald R. Ford.[16] On all questionnaires, subjects were given a guarantee of the anonymity of their responses to the items. Upon completion of all the scales, all subjects were debriefed by the researcher as to the specific nature of the study.

Overview of Data Analysis

The data derived from this study were submitted to a variety of statistical procedures; (1) single sample *t*-test, to test the underlying extremity assumption of the semantic differential against any other positioning of the ideal male political candidate; (2) strength of association test (omega squared), to determine the substantive effect of any significant deviations from the extremity assumption; and (3) multiple regression analysis, to test the utility of a standard coding strategy, as opposed to an overall recoding strategy, or an individual recoding strategy, in the prediction of overall credibility or homophily from the responses to the individual items for the real candidate.

Means and Standard Deviations for Ideal Political Candidate

Means[17] for the responses to the ideal political candidate credibility items fell between 1.352 ("honest-dishonest") and 3.496 ("adventurous-cautious"), with thirteen of the items below 2.0, thirteen of the items between 2.0 and 3.0, and three of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations[18] for these items ranged from 0.716 ("intelligent-unintelligent") to 1.510 ("calm-anxious"), with thirteen of the items below 1.0, fifteen of the items between 1.0 and 1.5, and one of the items over 1.5.

Means for the responses to the ideal political candidate homophily items fell between 2.418 ("shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs") and 3.697 ("personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine"), with four of the items below 3.0 and nine of the items over 3.0. Standard deviations for these items ranged from 1.019 ("likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like") to 1.444 ("educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine").

Single Sample *t*-Values and Strengths of Association (W^2) for Ideal Political Candidate

Upon completion of the frequency distributions to establish ideal candidate means and standard deviations, the data were submitted to a one-tailed single sample *t*-test, as described by Blalock (1960),[19] using a .05 level as an acceptable criterion for significance. This procedure was performed in order to test the underlying extremity assumption of the semantic differential against any other positioning of the ideal source on the scale.[20]

Using 1.652 as the critical value of *t* at the .05 level for subjects responding to the ideal political candidate, it was determined that a significant difference existed between the observed mean and the expected mean (the extremity assumption for the ideal political candidate) for all credibility and homophily items.[21] The *t*-values emerging from this analysis ranged as follows: (1) for political candidate credibility, from 8.476 ("reliable-unreliable") to 44.574 ("attractive-unattractive"); and (2) for political candidate homophily, from 24.877 ("shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs") to 45.712 ("personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine").

Following this procedure, the data were submitted to a strength of association test (omega squared),[22] as described by Hays (1963),[23] to determine the substantive effect of significant deviations from the extremity assumption.[24] In doing so, the following range of percentages was found: (1) for political candidate credibility, from 14.51% ("honest-dishonest") to 83.66% ("attractive-unattractive"); and (2) for political candidate homophily, from 61.43% ("shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs") to 84.30% ("personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine"). Employing 40% as a criterion for omega squared values in determining actual significant deviations from the extreme,[25] it was found that for twenty out of the twenty-nine political candidate credibility items (69%) and for all of the political candidate homophily items, the deviations were statistically significant.

Development of an Overall Recoding Strategy

On the basis of the initial and subsequent omega squared calculations, the scale for each credibility and homophily item was adjusted to one of the following appropriate recoding strategies[26] (if it did not remain in the standard coding strategy):

Strategy 1 (standard coding)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strategy 2 (ideal is positioned at second interval)

2 1 2 3 4 5 6

Strategy 3 (ideal is positioned at third interval)

3 2 1 2 3 4 5

Strategy 4 (ideal is positioned at fourth interval)

4 3 2 1 2 3 4

Figure 4. Overall Recoding Strategies Adapted for Credibility and Homophily Items.

The appropriateness of one overall recoding strategy over another for each individual item was determined by the lowest omega squared value obtained in connection with that item. If, for example, an item had a mean of 2.473, it was submitted to two strength of association tests beyond the initial omega squared calculation. In the two subsequent analyses, an omega squared value was obtained with an expected mean of two, then with three, rather than with one, as had been done in the initial calculation. The subsequent analyses were conducted to check the significance of the deviation of the actual mean (2.473) against the second and third interval (using an expected mean of two and three, respectively), such that the lowest of the three omega squared values could be used as an indicator for the appropriate overall recoding strategy for that particular item.[27]

Development of an Individual Recoding Strategy

On the assumption that the overall recoding strategy might provide scale adjustments which would be too gross in scope, an individual recoding strategy was also developed for subsequent analyses to be undertaken in this study. While the overall recoding strategy allowed for adjustments of the semantic differential scale for each individual credibility and homophily item, it did so on the basis of overall scores from all respondents. The appropriateness of one recoding strategy over another was dictated by the overall mean for an individual item, as well as the standard deviation, t-value, and omega squared value.

In contrast to this option, the individual recoding strategy was designed to take into account the responses of each single subject to the ideal political candidate on each individual item. In this case, each item was recoded for each single individual, not simply for the group as a whole. For example, if one individual positioned the ideal at the second interval for an item and another individual positioned the ideal for that same item at the third interval, then the second strategy and the third strategy illustrated in Figure 4 previously were employed for these individuals, respectively.

Multiple Regression Analyses

The data derived from responses to the personal referent, presidential candidate Gerald Ford, were submitted to step-wise multiple regression analysis.[28] The criterion variable for the analysis was the overall statement for the construct in question,[29] while the predictor variables were the scale items themselves. Upon the completion of this analysis, a second step-wise multiple regression analysis[30] was performed on this data, based upon the overall recoding strategy suggested by the responses to the ideal source for each item. And, finally, a third step-wise multiple regression analysis was conducted, on the basis of the individual recoding strategy dictated by each individual respondent for each single ideal source scale item. The results of the multiple regression analyses were designed to provide a comparison of the amount of variance accounted for by the various coding strategies (standard, overall recoding, individual recoding), such that the highest of the percentages could be taken to reflect the best predictor in describing overall source credibility or homophily.

Using a standard coding strategy, credibility items accounted for 58.09% of the total variance in a multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "competent-incompetent"--41.91%; (2) "good-bad"--6.52%; and (3) "believable-unbelievable"--2.45%.

The total variance accounted for by homophily items in a standard coding strategy multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable was 58.44%. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs"--45.17%; (2) "political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine"--5.61%; and (3) "goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine"--2.25%.

Using an overall recoding strategy, credibility items accounted for 57.80% of the total variance in a multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "competent-incompetent"--41.91%; (2) "good-bad"--6.52%; and (3) "believable-unbelievable"--2.45%.

The total variance accounted for by homophily items in an overall recoding strategy multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable was 51.18%. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs"--43.30%; (2) "likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like"--4.31%; and (3) "political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine"--0.84%.

Using an individual recoding strategy, credibility items accounted for 53.90% of the total variance in a multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "responsible-undependable"--36.24%; (2) "competent-incompetent"--6.55%; and (3) "good-bad"--3.94%.

The total variance accounted for by homophily items in an individual recoding strategy multiple regression analysis in predicting the criterion variable was 46.91%. The top three items emerging from the analysis were: (1) "shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs"--30.43%; (2) "likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like"--8.40%; and (3) "goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine"--2.54%.

Discussion

A principle concern of this study was the examination of the ideal source within a political campaign context in order to provide further evidence for the disconfirmation of the extremity assumption of the semantic differential.

In this regard, it is important to note the specific strength of association percentages for the various items. The most obvious fact to note is the substantially higher omega squared values for the homophily items than for the credibility items. While some of the source credibility items did fall into high percentage categories (nine over 60%), all of the homophily items did. Performance of the strength of association test demonstrated that deviations between observed and expected means, while significant for all homophily items, were significant for only twenty out of twenty-nine credibility items. This finding suggests that while the extremity assumption is invalid for all items in regard to the measurement of the ideal homophilous political candidate, it is invalid for only the majority, or 69%, of the items in regard to the ideal credible political candidate. Hellweg (1976) reports a similar finding in connection with a study pertaining to the ideal supervisor and subordinate.

In terms of response means, the majority of ideal source credibility items fell between the first and second interval (thirteen) and between the second and third interval (thirteen) of the semantic differential scale. In contrast, the majority of the homophily items fell between the third and fourth interval (nine) of the semantic differential scale. This finding suggests that, relatively speaking, source credibility conforms more to the extreme positioning on the semantic differential scale than does homophily for the ideal political candidate. This is also in line with the findings of the Hellweg study relating to the ideal supervisor and subordinate.

It is conceivable that the high level of responding at or toward the neutral area of the semantic differential (as reflected in the means) for the ideal candidate, accompanied by large variances in response patterns (as reflected in the standard deviations) for particular items, occurred as a result of the absence of true bipolar adjectives for these scales. Cases in point would be "adventurous-cautious," "intellectual-narrow," and "verbal-quiet." An alternative explanation for such occurrences, as well as for those items with high means but moderate standard deviations, might be that the respondents found certain items to be relatively immaterial criteria in perceiving the ideal political candidate. Examples of items, perhaps, fitting within the parameters of this explanation would be: "personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine," "educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine" and "from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine." One should be cautioned, however, in making such interpretations, since it is, in fact, often difficult to determine whether respondents find an item an immaterial criterion in evaluating a target source, or whether they actually envision that source in this position on the scale for that item. An example in this study might be the item "attractive-unattractive," for which the mean was 3.407.[31]

Given that the extremity assumption would be at least to some degree disconfirmed for the data collected, this study was designed to investigate the consequences of various coding strategies (standard, overall, individual) upon semantic differential scale items, so as to determine the means to account for the greatest amount of variance in describing the overall construct in question. It seems appropriate first to discuss the measuring techniques utilized in this study for that purpose, in an attempt to understand why there was no improvement in accounting for this variance, either for credibility or homophily, as a function of the various strategies.

The criterion variable utilized in the multiple regression analyses performed in this study was the same for both the credibility and homophily items. While the assessment of credibility involves the evaluation of a target source by a receiver, the assessment of homophily involves the evaluation of the relationship between the target source and the receiver. This may or may not have had implications in the generation of the results for these analyses.

Another important concern about the criterion variable is whether or not the standard coding strategy for the Likert scale item is appropriate in its pre-

diction as a function of responses to the real candidate for an individual who marked all or a large majority of the ideal items away from the extreme. It seems reasonable to raise the question that if the real candidate items were recoded in some fashion, that the item they were predicting, perhaps, should have also been recoded. The obvious difficulty with this suggestion lies in the determination of how forty-two credibility and homophily items, each recoded in several different possible ways, could dictate the appropriate recoding strategy for this single item.

In the administration of the questionnaires to the respondents, the researcher made a request that they not look back, while in the process of evaluating the real candidate, to the way in which they completed the credibility and homophily items for the ideal candidate. It is very possible that an individual forgot the specific positioning of the ideal on each individual item, when he/she judged the acceptability of the real candidate on those same items.

In addition to the slippage which may have occurred in connection with the transfer from ideal to real candidate items, there may have been some slippage in the transfer from target source semantic differential items to the criterion variable Likert scale item.

Another methodological concern lies in the choice of Gerald Ford as a political candidate for this study. Since Gerald Ford had been the incumbent President, subjects may have responded to him as a President, rather than as a presidential candidate. This distinction is critical, since individuals judge candidates on the basis of how they feel the person will perform in the political office in question. It is an evaluation of the future, rather than of the present.

Unlike the majority of political candidate image studies, this research did not utilize, in any way, the issues of a campaign. Some of the items on the credibility instrument would seem to be dependent almost entirely upon issues. An example would be the item "adventurous-cautious." In addition, while the evaluation of the ideal political candidate may have been free of any reference to specific issues, the respondent may not have been able to evaluate Gerald Ford as a candidate apart from the issues of the campaign.

When subjects completed items in reference to the ideal candidate, they were not given a specific political office for which this individual would be seeking a term. However, when subjects completed items in reference to the real candidate, Gerald Ford, they did so in reference to the election for the Presidency. There may have been some slippage here, since, for example, political party similarities between candidate and voter may be of different importance to respondents according to the type of election involved.

While all of these concerns can be taken into consideration, they do not provide any insight into the reasons why the recoding strategies did not offer better predictive ability than the standard strategy or why the individual recoding strategy was not an improvement over the overall recoding strategy. Despite these results, it is interesting to note, however, that the overall recoding strategy provided a greater number of totally accurate predictions[32] for the marking of the criterion variable (twenty-two for credibility, sixteen for homophily) than the standard coding strategy (seven for credibility, fifteen for homophily) and that the individual recoding strategy provided a greater number (twenty-seven for credibility, eighteen for homophily) than the overall recoding strategy (twenty-two for credibility, sixteen for homophily). The fact that these lists generally contained different respondents, but sometimes contained the same on two, suggests that for some subjects one strategy was better than the other two, while for other subjects either of two strategies was better than the other.[33]

Implications for Future Research

The implications of this study are somewhat limited due to the inconclusive nature of the majority of the results. However, this research does seem to provide some basis for future study, perhaps, if not in replication, then at least

with modification.

The extremity assumption appears to have been definitely disconfirmed for the homophily construct and for the majority of items relating to the credibility construct. This has now been demonstrated with statistical significance for supervisor/subordinate target sources (Hellweg, 1976), as well as for the political candidate target source. This finding lends itself to prescriptive interpretations for real sources within these categories, as well as for researchers attempting to induce high and low forms of source valence.

Additionally, while the utility of implementing a recoding strategy for the semantic differential was not confirmed, it does appear that present operational procedures for the use of the instrument in conjunction with the performance of factor analyses need to be further examined. Future researchers should concentrate upon the development of an appropriate criterion variable and recoding strategy. The potential adverse consequences of present operating procedures is a worthwhile area for further study. The methodology utilized in this study is in need of further evaluation as a means to provide this evidence.

FOOTNOTES

1. For example, see King, 1971.

2. For example, see Lashbrook and McCroskey, 1972.

3. Source credibility may be defined as the degree of confidence in or favorable disposition toward a communicator. Homophily may be defined as the degree of perceived similarity between source and receiver in reference to a single attribute or a group of attributes.

4. There are a number of metric assumptions underlying the construction of the semantic differential (see Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957). The scales are assumed to be bipolar and equal interval in nature; the zero point is assumed to fall at the centroid of the scale. It is assumed that the terms "extremely," "quite," and "slightly" appropriately define rating positions, as they move from the ends toward the centroid. While a few studies (for example, Messick, 1957) have been aimed at questioning those metric properties of the semantic differential described and have, to some degree, shown that these assumptions are faulty, the conclusion has been that these discrepancies are not significant and that normal statistical techniques can be applied (see Heise, 1969; Lemon, 1973) to data derived through use of the instrument.

5. See Rogers and Bhowmik, 1970.

6. This assumes that people do not see themselves at the extreme positive end of the scale and prefer not to associate with others superior to them.

7. This is in direct contrast with the effects of stereotyping, which presumably would lead to high agreement among receivers as to the attributes of the ideal source.

8. This assumes that dissimilarity in terms of at least a competence dimension (that is, the source is perceived as having greater competence than the receiver relative to the topic in question) heightens persuasive impact.

9. Deviation scores were calculated by comparing the actual cumulative frequencies to the expected cumulative frequencies for each interval of each scale item. Using a range of .000 to 1.000 for possible deviation scores, the researcher assumed that the higher the deviation score, the closer the relationship between the actual and expected distributions, thus the greater the approximation to the assumption of the semantic differential.

10. An item was categorized as being significantly away from the extreme if, after submission of the data to a strength of association test (based upon the results of a single sample t-test between actual and ideal scores), it corresponded with an omega squared value of 40% or greater.

11. In this research, McCroskey, Jensen, and Todd isolated five dimensions of public figure credibility: (1) competence; (2) character; (3) composure; (4) extroversion; and (5) sociability.

12. For the purposes of this research, these scales were modified to semantic differential form from their original Likert scale form in order to fit within the parameters of the design of the study in which examination

of the semantic differential was to be the focal point.

13. In this research, Andersen and Todd isolated three dimensions of public figure homophily: (1) attitude-belief homophily; (2) background homophily; and (3) personality homophily.

14. A male target source was selected so as to establish some perceptual uniformity among the respondents (for example, in conceptualizing the attractiveness of the source). It was additionally justified by the fact that the real political candidate used in the study was a male, as are the majority of political candidates today.

15. These questionnaires, however, were augmented by the following item:

    This individual is an ideal political candidate:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Undecided	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree

16. For comparative purposes, it was determined that the target source should be the same for all respondents. For purposes of familiarity, a presidential candidate was selected, Gerald Ford being chosen over Jimmy Carter by the flip of a coin.

17. Refer to the Appendix for all of the means for responses to the ideal political candidate on all credibility and homophily items.

18. Refer to the Appendix for all of the standard deviations for responses to the ideal political candidate on all credibility and homophily items.

19. The formula utilized for this procedure was:

$$t = \frac{\text{actual } \bar{x} - 1}{\text{standard deviation}/\sqrt{n - 1}}$$

20. For this analysis, as well as all others associated with this study, the number "one" represented the extreme positive end of the scale, while the number "seven" represented the extreme negative end of the scale.

21. Refer to the Appendix for the results of the single sample t-test on the credibility and homophily items.

22. Initially, modal responses were considered as appropriate indicators for the marking of items away from the extreme positive end of the scale. Omega squared seemed to be a more viable alternative, however, since it provided a means to take variability of response into account as a result of the single sample t-test calculation preceding it. This distinction appeared to be important, since without the consideration of variability, the interpretation which resulted from the analysis would exclude the specific positioning for every single score (the most frequent response being the only criterion considered).

23. The formula utilized for this procedure was:

$$W^2 = \frac{t^2 - 1}{t^2 + (n - 1)}$$

24. Refer to the Appendix for the results of the strength of association test (W^2) on the credibility and homophily items.

25. This 40% criterion was utilized in research conducted by Hellweg (1976) on the ideal supervisor and subordinate. In both cases, a review of the data indicated a logical separation at this point, in terms of the location of the specific percentages, as well as the type of items they represented.

26. Refer to the Appendix for a delineation of the specific overall recoding strategy employed for each credibility and homophily item.

27. Upon completion of these calculations, it was discovered that any item with a mean between 1.743 and 2.5 was placed in the second overall recoding strategy, any item with a mean between 2.5 and 3.5 was placed in the third overall recoding strategy, and any item with a mean between 3.5 and 4.5 was placed in the fourth overall recoding strategy. (Any item with a mean under 1.743 remained within the standard coding strategy, as determined by the initial omega squared calculation.)

28. Refer to the Appendix for a copy of the results of the multiple regression analyses.

29. This overall statement was provided by the responses to the additional question utilized in the second set of questionnaires, which asked respondents to what degree they considered the personal referent, Gerald Ford, to be an ideal political candidate.

30. The criterion variable for the second and third multiple regression analyses was the same as for the first, the predictor variables being the recoded items (as well as those items not in need of recoding).

31. It may, in fact, have been the case that the respondents did not want to admit that attractiveness plays a part in their evaluation of the acceptability of political candidates.

32. This was determined by examination of the plots of the standardized residuals.

33. To provide a more complete picture of these results, an examination of the residuals for subjects whose predictions were the farthest off for the total sample was undertaken (in this case, for those over 3.0 for at least one strategy). This examination revealed a very similar pattern to the one described within the text of this paper, with one strategy often better than the other two (there being no consistency for the particular strategy involved), or with two strategies equally more effective than a third.

REFERENCES

Andersen, Peter, A. and Kibler, Robert J. The effect of source credibility, attraction, and homophily on voter preference. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, April 1976.

Andersen, Peter A. and Todd, William R. Scales for the measurement of homophily with public figures. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, April 1975.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Clark, Ruth Anne, Stewart, Roy, and Marston, Alan. Scale values for highest and lowest levels of credibility. Central States Speech Journal, 1972, 23, 193-196.

Hays, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Heise, David R. Some methodological issues in semantic differential research. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 72, 406-422.

Heise, David R. The semantic differential and attitude research. Attitude Measurement. By Gene Summers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1970, 235-253.

Hellweg, Susan A. Perception of a communication source: An examination of the ideal supervisor and subordinate within a military organization. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Portland, Oregon, April 1976.

Heston, Judee K. Ideal source credibility: A reexamination of the semantic differential. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Montreal, Quebec, April 1973.

King, Stephen W. An experimental analysis of the effect of message type, degree of interpersonal similarity, and type of interpersonal similarity on attitude change and ratings of source credibility. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

King, Stephen W. and Sereno, Kenneth K. Attitude change as a function of degree and type of interpersonal similarity and message type. Western Speech, 1973, 37, 328-332.

Lashbrook, Velma J. and McCroskey, James C. Source valence: An improved conceptualization. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Honolulu, Hawaii, November 1972.

Lemon, Nigel. Attitudes and Their Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

McCroskey, James C., Jensen, Thomas, and Todd, Cynthia. The generalizability of source credibility scales for public figures. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, Illinois, December 1972.

Messick, Samuel J. Metric properties of the semantic differential. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1957, 17, 200-206.

Osgood, Charles E., Suci, George J., and Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Rogers, Everett and Bhowmik, Dilip K. Homophily-heterophily: Relational concepts for communication research. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1970, 34, 523-538.

Tannenbaum, Percy H., Greenberg, Bradley S., and Silverman, Fred R. Candidates images. The Great Debates. Edited by Sidney Kraus. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1962, 271-288.

APPENDIX

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, t VALUES, STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (W^2) FOR IDEAL POLITICAL CANDIDATE--CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Single Sample t Value	W^2
experienced-inexperienced	1.995	0.996	19.510	49.33%
believable-unbelievable -	1.743	0.987	14.860	36.11%
bold-timid ----------	2.473	1.042	27.793	66.48%
poised-nervous ----------	2.039	1.099	18.554	46.88%
attractive-unattractive -	3.407	1.071	44.574	83.66%
sociable-unsociable -----	2.151	1.022	22.135	55.63%
admirable-contemptible --	2.023	1.009	20.059	50.78%
adventurous-cautious ----	3.496	1.439	34.192	75.11%
nice-awful ----------	2.415	1.040	26.698	64.72%
reliable-unreliable -----	1.356	0.827	8.476	15.44%
relaxed-tense ----------	2.290	1.066	23.889	59.36%
good-bad ----------	1.703	0.917	14.958	36.53%
verbal-quiet ----------	2.536	1.123	26.947	65.03%
energetic-tired ---------	1.699	0.870	15.886	39.26%
just-unjust ----------	1.421	0.819	10.024	20.32%
cheerful-gloomy ---------	2.139	0.993	22.780	57.11%
honest-dishonest --------	1.352	0.838	8.186	14.51%
calm-anxious ----------	3.028	1.510	26.338	64.04%
intellectual-narrow -----	1.927	0.948	19.313	49.08%
talkative-silent --------	2.894	1.146	32.655	73.30%
kind-cruel ----------	2.072	1.011	21.020	53.06%
extroverted-introverted -	2.720	1.147	29.655	69.31%
good-natured-irritable --	1.890	0.858	20.227	51.14%
responsible-undependable	1.364	0.773	9.333	18.09%
aggressive-meek ---------	2.590	1.025	30.577	70.54%
trained-untrained -------	1.977	1.002	19.157	48.41%
competent-incompetent ---	1.506	0.860	11.500	25.23%
expert-inexpert ---------	2.095	1.029	21.058	53.15%
intelligent-unintelligent	1.485	0.716	13.472	31.64%

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, t VALUES, STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (W^2) FOR IDEAL POLITICAL CANDIDATE--HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Single Sample t Value	W^2
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine -----	3.647	1.135	45.638	84.29%
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine ----------	2.609	1.187	26.817	64.86%
political party same as mine-political party different than mine ----	3.434	1.323	36.328	77.22%
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine -----	3.697	1.158	45.712	84.30%
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine -	3.647	1.256	41.359	81.50%
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs -------	2.418	1.116	24.877	61.43%
like me-unlike me --------	3.503	1.103	44.696	83.73%
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine -	2.705	1.230	27.064	65.40%
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine ----------	3.492	1.075	45.309	84.10%
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like ----------	3.296	1.019	44.154	83.36%
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine -----	3.692	1.444	36.877	77.75%

continued....

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, t VALUES, STRENGTHS OF ASSOCIATION (W^2) FOR IDEAL POLITICAL CANDIDATE--HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Single Sample t Value	W^2
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine ----	2.746	1.272	26.862	64.94%
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine -	3.553	1.336	37.544	78.36%

OVERALL RECODING STRATEGY
UTILIZED FOR EACH SCALE ITEM
CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Overall Recoding Strategy Utilized
experienced-inexperienced	2
believable-unbelievable	1
bold-timid	2
poised nervous	2
attractive-unattractive	3
sociable-unsociable	2
admirable-contemptible	2
adventurous-cautious	3
nice-awful	2
reliable-unreliable	1
relaxed-tense	2
good-bad	1
verbal-quiet	3
energetic-tired	1
just-unjust	1
cheerful-gloomy	2
honest-dishonest	1
calm-anxious	3
intellectual-narrow	2
talkative-silent	3
kind-cruel	2
extroverted-introverted	3
good-natured-irritable	2
responsible-undependable	1
aggressive-meek	3
trained-untrained	2
competent-incompetent	1

continued....

OVERALL RECODING STRATEGY UTILIZED FOR EACH SCALE ITEM

CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Overall Recoding Strategy Utilized
expert-inexpert	2
intelligent-unintelligent	1

Strategy 1 = (Standard Coding) $\overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}\ \overline{7}$

Strategy 2 = $\overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}$

Strategy 3 = $\overline{3}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}$

Strategy 4 = $\overline{4}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}$

OVERALL RECODING STRATEGY UTILIZED FOR EACH SCALE ITEM

HOMOPHILY

	Overall Recoding Strategy Utilized
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine	4
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine	3
political party same as mine-political party different than mine	3
personalty similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine	4
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine	4
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs	2
like me-unlike me	4
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine	3
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine-	3
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like	3
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine	4
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine	3
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine	4

Strategy 1 (Standard Coding) = $\overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}\ \overline{7}$

Strategy 2 = $\overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}\ \overline{6}$

Strategy 3 = $\overline{3}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}\ \overline{5}$

Strategy 4 = $\overline{4}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{1}\ \overline{2}\ \overline{3}\ \overline{4}$

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

STANDARD STRATEGY

CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
competent-incompetent ----	0.64742	0.41916	0.41916	0.64742
good-bad ----------	0.69598	0.48439	0.06523	0.61541
believable-unbelievable --	0.71343	0.50898	0.02459	0.59504
adventurous-cautious -----	0.72722	0.52885	0.01987	0.39165
intelligent-unintelligent-	0.73722	0.54350	0.01465	0.53856
just-unjust ----------	0.74125	0.54945	0.00596	0.57792
bold-timid ----------	0.74460	0.55443	0.00497	0.30920
kind-cruel ----------	0.74684	0.55776	0.00334	0.40417
calm-anxious ----------	0.74961	0.56192	0.00415	0.19785
energetic-tired ----------	0.75143	0.56464	0.00273	0.47099
attractive-unattractive --	0.75322	0.56734	0.00270	0.32982
expert-inexpert ----------	0.75446	0.56922	0.00188	0.59007
admirable-contemptible ---	0.75557	0.57089	0.00167	0.52730
honest-dishonest ---------	0.75649	0.57228	0.00139	0.56893
responsible-undependable -	0.75788	0.57439	0.00211	0.57968
poised-nervous ----------	0.75888	0.57590	0.00151	0.41057
experienced-inexperienced-	0.75950	0.57684	0.00094	0.48470
extroverted-introverted --	0.76002	0.57763	0.00079	0.27961
verbal-quiet ----------	0.76057	0.57847	0.00084	0.22308
cheerful-gloomy ----------	0.76091	0.57899	0.00052	0.40488
sociable-unsociable ------	0.76133	0.57962	0.00063	0.30939
aggressive-meek ----------	0.76165	0.58011	0.00049	0.41144
trained-untrained --------	0.76193	0.58054	0.00043	0.49765
intellectual-narrow ------	0.76210	0.58080	0.00026	0.49067
relaxed-tense ----------	0.76216	0.58090	0.00010	0.38801
reliable-unreliable ------	0.76220	0.58095	0.00006	0.56023
talkative-silent ---------	0.76222	0.58099	0.00003	0.27209

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

STANDARD STRATEGY

HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs	0.67212	0.45175	0.45175	0.67212
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine	0.71264	0.50786	0.05611	0.65531
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine	0.72829	0.53040	0.02254	0.62585
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine	0.73554	0.54102	0.01061	0.55013
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine	0.74240	0.55116	0.01014	0.14963
political party same as mine-political party different than mine	0.75055	0.56332	0.01216	0.40022
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine	0.75837	0.57513	0.01181	0.47971
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like	0.76120	0.57943	0.00431	0.56801
like me-unlike me	0.76295	0.58209	0.00266	0.56236
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine-	0.76372	0.58327	0.00117	0.29008
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine	0.76428	0.58413	0.00086	0.64971
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine	0.76440	0.58431	0.00019	0.24419
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine	0.76446	0.58441	0.00009	0.32873

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
OVERALL RECODING STRATEGY
CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
competent-incompetent ----	0.64742	0.41916	0.41916	0.64742
good-bad ----------	0.69598	0.48439	0.06523	0.61541
believable-unbelievable --	0.71343	0.50898	0.02459	0.59504
intelligent-unintelligent-	0.72671	0.52810	0.01913	0.53856
adventurous-cautious -----	0.73333	0.53778	0.00968	0.32257
energetic-tired ----------	0.73853	0.54543	0.00765	0.47099
just-unjust ----------	0.74146	0.54976	0.00433	0.57792
attractive-unattractive --	0.74504	0.55508	0.00532	0.31446
poised-nervous ----------	0.74679	0.55770	0.00262	0.39833
verbal-quiet ----------	0.74812	0.55969	0.00198	0.19997
honest-dishonest ---------	0.74937	0.56155	0.00187	0.56893
good-natured-irritable ---	0.75053	0.56330	0.00174	0.34542
expert-inexpert ----------	0.75184	0.56526	0.00196	0.57314
responsible-undependable -	0.75304	0.56706	0.00181	0.57968
admirable-contemptible ---	0.75428	0.56894	0.00188	0.50450
extroverted-introverted --	0.75539	0.57061	0.00167	0.18843
cheerful-gloomy ----------	0.75615	0.57177	0.00116	0.37944
nice-awful ----------	0.75676	0.57269	0.00093	0.42437
bold-timid ----------	0.75750	0.57381	0.00112	0.32219
trained-untrained --------	0.75823	0.57492	0.00111	0.41104
intellectual-narrow ------	0.75876	0.57572	0.00080	0.45845
kind-cruel ----------	0.75918	0.57636	0.00064	0.36451
calm-anxious ----------	0.75954	0.57690	0.00054	0.20324
sociable-unsociable ------	0.76000	0.57760	0.00070	0.28606
experienced-inexperienced-	0.76023	0.57795	0.00035	0.40647
relaxed-tense ----------	0.76026	0.57799	0.00004	0.38375
aggressive-meek ----------	0.76028	0.57802	0.00003	0.28295
talkative-silent ---------	0.76030	0.57805	0.00003	0.20693

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

OVERALL RECODING STRATEGY

HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs	0.65809	0.43308	0.43308	0.65809
likes same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like	0.69009	0.47622	0.04314	0.57202
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine	0.69620	0.48469	0.00847	0.55804
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine	0.70312	0.49437	0.00969	0.19988
political party same as mine-political party different than mine	0.70762	0.50072	0.00635	0.37773
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine	0.70954	0.50344	0.00272	0.56395
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine	0.71163	0.50642	0.00298	0.22748
like me-unlike me	0.71324	0.50872	0.00229	0.36722
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine	0.71431	0.51023	0.00152	0.20895
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine	0.71478	0.51091	0.00068	0.18894
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine	0.71508	0.51133	0.00042	0.48067
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine	0.71538	0.51177	0.00044	0.36281
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine	0.71545	0.51187	0.00010	0.30912

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
INDIVIDUAL RECODING STRATEGY
CREDIBILITY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
responsible-undependable --------	0.60205	0.36246	0.36246	0.60205
competent-incompetent ----------	0.65419	0.42797	0.06551	0.59393
good-bad ----------	0.68371	0.46746	0.03949	0.55464
intelligent-unintelligent -------	0.69863	0.48808	0.02062	0.51415
just-unjust ----------	0.70513	0.49721	0.00913	0.53526
poised-nervous ----------	0.71066	0.50504	0.00783	0.39990
believable-unbelievable ---------	0.71524	0.51157	0.00652	0.53681
attractive-unattractive ---------	0.71784	0.51530	0.00373	0.18203
nice-awful ----------	0.71992	0.51829	0.00299	0.33745
cheerful-gloomy ----------	0.72214	0.52149	0.00320	0.34026
honest-dishonest ----------	0.72396	0.52412	0.00263	0 53515
bold-timid ----------	0.72538	0.52617	0.00205	0.32177
reliable-unreliable ----------	0.72631	0.52753	0.00136	0.53682
intellectual-narrow ----------	0.72729	0.52895	0.00141	0.47833
extroverted-introverted ---------	0.72808	0.53010	0.00115	0.27784
kind-cruel ----------	0.72881	0.53116	0.00107	0.35363
verbal-quiet ----------	0.72957	0.53227	0.00111	0.26443
talkative-silent ----------	0.73021	0.53321	0.00094	0.24004
good-natured-irritable ----------	0.73089	0.53420	0.00099	0.38819
sociable-unsociable ----------	0.73148	0.53506	0.00086	0.23437
adventurous-cautious ----------	0.73203	0.53586	0.00080	0.28581
expert-inexpert ----------	0.73257	0.53665	0.00079	0.47902
experienced-inexperienced -------	0.73312	0.53746	0.00081	0.36522
relaxed-tense ----------	0.73352	0.53805	0.00059	0.33816
aggressive-meek ----------	0.73382	0.53849	0.00044	0.30512
calm-anxious ----------	0.73404	0.53882	0.00033	0.30909
trained-untrained ----------	0.73411	0.53892	0.00010	0.42621
admirable-contemptible ----------	0.73417	0.53900	0.00008	0.44849

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

INDIVIDUAL RECODING STRATEGY

HOMOPHILY

Scale Item	Multiple R	R Square	RSQ Change	Simple R
shares my beliefs-doesn't share my beliefs ----------	0.55172	0.30439	0.30439	0.55172
like same politicians that I like-doesn't like same politicians that I like ----------	0.62327	0.38847	0.08408	0.49424
goals for the country same as mine-goals for the country different than mine ----------	0.64335	0.41390	0.02543	0.46324
personality similar to mine-personality dissimilar to mine-	0.65436	0.42818	0.01429	0.37690
political beliefs same as mine-political beliefs different than mine ----------	0.66310	0.43970	0.01152	0.49759
from same social class as mine-from different social class than mine ----------	0.66867	0.44713	0.00742	0.09191
political party same as mine-political party different than mine ----------	0.67560	0.45644	0.00931	0.30909
like me-unlike me ----------	0.67916	0.46126	0.00482	0.43355
educational background similar to mine-educational background dissimilar to mine ----------	0.68260	0.46594	0.00468	0.13702
political attitudes about the same as mine-political attitudes not about the same as mine ----------	0.68361	0.46733	0.00139	0.53146
goals in life about same as mine-goals in life not about same as mine ----------	0.68445	0.46847	0.00114	0.31847
background similar to mine-background dissimilar to mine -	0.68496	0.46917	0.00070	0.27639
cultural background similar to mine-cultural background dissimilar to mine ----------	0.68497	0.46918	0.00002	0.25982